



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SHORTER NOTES

THE SCIENTIFIC NAME OF OUR COMMON HUCKLEBERRY. — In 1787, Wangenheim (Beitr. Am. 30. *pl.* 39. *f.* 69) published a description of a plant named by him *Andromeda baccata*. The figure of the plant is a fair one, and from it and the description there is no doubt that the plant so named is the common American huckleberry. Two years later, Aiton (Hort. Kew. 2: 12) published the name *Vaccinium resinum* for the same plant, and when in 1843 the plant was referred to *Gaylussacia* by Torrey & Gray (Torr. Fl. N. Y. 1: 449) the combination *Gaylussacia resinosa* was made. Since that time the plant has appeared in American botanies as *Gaylussacia resinosa* (Ait.) T. & G., but the above synonymy and the correct name of our plant were noticed many years ago by K. Koch (Dendrol. 2¹: 93. 1872), and it would seem to be proper for American botanists now to adopt the name published by him for this common and well-known plant, namely *Gaylussacia baccata* (Wang.) K. Koch.

In like manner, the form published by Professor Robinson as *Gaylussacia resinosa glaucocarpa* (Rhodora 2: 83) should become ***Gaylussacia baccata glaucocarpa***.

KENNETH K. MACKENZIE

EAST ORANGE, NEW JERSEY.

A NEW LENTINUS FROM PENNSYLVANIA. — ***Lentinus pulcherrimus*** sp. nov. Pileus entire, coriaceous, umbilicate, indistinctly marked with concentric zones, covered with fascicles of yellowish tan-colored hairs, the fascicles arranged in radiating rows, giving the pileus a corrugated appearance; margin inflexed, 2 cm. broad, covered with lanate hairs; flesh white, scarcely 1 mm. thick; gills white, narrow, subdistant, rounded behind, free, margin entire; stem central, concolorous with the pileus, tomentose, equal, solid, white within, 3 cm. long, 1.5 mm. thick; spores white, broadly ovate; odor fetid, especially in drying, finally disappearing, somewhat like the odor of *Claudopus nidulans*.

Growing on buried sticks, Kittanning, Pa. July, 1904.

Type specimens are in the Carnegie Museum, Pittsburgh, Pa.

In general appearance the plants resemble specimens of *Coltricia cinnamomea* (Jacq.) Murrill, and might be mistaken for that

species. It is also closely allied to the following tropical species, *L. villosus*, *L. siparius*, *L. sparsibarbis*, *L. pyramidatus*. The following table will aid in distinguishing the different species :

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Pileus with two kinds of hairs, lanate and rigid. | 1. |
| Pileus not as above. | 2. |
| 1. Pileus yellowish tan-colored, slightly umbilicate. | <i>L. pulcherrimus</i> . |
| 1. Pileus orange, deeply umbilicate. | <i>L. stiparius</i> B. & C. |
| 2. Hairs of pileus in pyramidal fascicles. | <i>L. pyramidatus</i> B. & C. |
| 2. Hairs of pileus fascicled toward center, scattered and depressed. | <i>L. sparsibarbis</i> B. & C. |
| 2. Hairs of pileus not fascicled. | <i>L. villous</i> Klotsch |

DAVID R. SUMSTINE.

WILKINSBURG, PA.

A NEW SPECIES OF EVOLVULUS FROM COLOMBIA. — The following new species was detected among the specimens of *Evolvulus* in the National Herbarium at the time the three Mexican species described by the writer* were studied :

Evolvulus sericatus sp. nov.

§ *Alsinoidei*. Stems herbaceous from a perennial root, erect, 3–5 dm. tall, slender, usually branching above; stem silky-hirsute with appressed hairs; leaf-blades sessile or the petioles less than 1 mm. long, narrowly oblong-lanceolate, usually broadest near the middle, 1–2 cm. long, about one-third as wide, rounded or obtuse at the base, the apex obtuse and submucronate, densely and finely appressed silky-villous above, more densely so beneath, both the lower and the upper leaves somewhat reduced; peduncles exceeding the subtending leaves, 1.5–2.5 cm. long, 3–9-flowered, bracts subulate, long-tipped, about 2 mm. long; pedicels 6–8 mm. long; sepals ovate-lanceolate, acuminate, 3–3.5 mm. long, densely silky-pubescent with subappressed hairs, the tips erect in fruit; corolla nearly rotate, 6–7 mm. broad, entire, blue with white plicae, the plicae hirsute without; capsules globose, 2-valved, 4-seeded; seeds glabrous, dark-brown, minutely roughened.

COLOMBIA: Papagayeras, 800 m. alt., *E. Langlasse*, no. 12, November 4, 1899. Type in the herbarium of the United States National Museum.

Related to *E. villosus* Ruiz & Pav., from which it differs by its

* Bull. Torrey Club 33: 315-317. 1906.

appressed silky pubescence and few-flowered peduncles. So many species of *Evolvulus* of northern South America extend into Central America and the West Indies that it is possible the species here described may be found in Panama or Central America.

HOMER D. HOUSE.

CLEMSON COLLEGE, SOUTH CAROLINA.

REVIEWS

Scott on the Present Position of Palaeozoic Botany*

Band 1, Heft 1, of *Progressus Rei Botanicae* published by the International Association of Botanists under the editorial supervision of Dr. J. P. Lotsy promises to be of very considerable value, if one may judge from the initial instalment. Leaving it to others to characterize the merits of Strasburger's and of Flahault's contributions, I wish to direct attention to the very valuable summary by Scott of "The Present Position of Palaeozoic Botany."

Paleobotany has been to such a large extent divorced from botany in the past and so largely ignored by botanists that I am sure that this summary will be read with surprise by a goodly number who have heretofore looked upon paleobotany with somewhat of disdain as a science engaged in the more or less questionable occupation of describing fragments of prehistoric plants whose identification is more or less uncertain. Granting that identifications are oftentimes not all that might be desired, and it may be remarked parenthetically that this shortcoming is not the exclusive possession of those who deal with fossil plants, nevertheless the fact remains that the number of fossil plants in some orders, as for instance the Cycadales, far exceeds their living representatives; other orders are wholly unknown in the modern flora (*Sphenophyllales*, *Cordiatales*); while in still other groups the modern representatives are but mere remnants of once large and complex assemblages whose existence would not have been

*Scott, D. H. The Present Position of Palaeozoic Botany. *Progressus Rei Botanicae* 1 : 139-217. 1907.